



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/707,923	11/08/2000	Richard M. Bentley	D/99628	9614
7590	02/15/2006		EXAMINER	
John E Beck Xerox Corporation Xerox Square 20A Rochester, NY 14644			TRAN, QUOC A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	

DATE MAILED: 02/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

09/707,923

Applicant(s)

BENTLEY ET AL.

Examiner

Quoc A. Tran

Art Unit

2176

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 29 January 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☒ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 1-3, 8, 10-13, 16-18, 21-24 and 29-38.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.

William L. Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
2/9/2006

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Applicant amended claims 3, 11, 18 and 38 to include new issues (i.e. the first display region at a [[generally]] fixed portion within the display image...), which changes the scope of the claim invention as whole, which could further required search/or consideration. It is noted that Applicant has amended the claims limitation to narrow the claim limitation to the location of the first display is at a fixed portion instead of generally which is contributing to the new issue of invention as whole, which has not been previously presented.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments filed after the final rejection on 01/29/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's arguments on pages 7-12, for claims 1-3, 8, 10-13, 16-18, 21-24 and 29-38; Applicant's Remark revolving the new issues set forth above in item (3), which change the scope of the claim invention as whole, which could further required search/or consideration.

To concisely address the elaborate arguments presented, the Examiner respectfully disagrees for the detailed reasons stated in the rejection of each claim limitation previously presented in Office Action mail date 10/25/2005 (please see rejections for detail). In further support of the previous Office Action, please note the following:

Additionally, the main thrust of the applicant's argument is Reichek, in view of Mclan, further in view of Allam do not teach or suggest movement of thumbnail view relative to a display region.

Using the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims, the Reichek, and Mclan, references fairly teach and/or suggest all the limitations but, moving in the display image the thumbnail view relative to the first region to indicate at least an approximate location within the thumbnail view of the word currently being displayed in the first display region, however (as taught by Mclan col. 3, lines 40-60), discloses an EIW (Enhanced Interactive Window) and electronic page view as a graphical form of an electronic page view which is triggered via a mouse or other selection device, anywhere in the display area of the EIW, advances the selection of free-flowing text viewed by the user.

Additionally, applicant's argument is Allam reference which benefit from Provisional 60/236,236 filed 09/28/2000 is not disclosed paragraphs [006] and [0040]-[0050]. The Examiner respectfully disagrees (Allam Provisional 60/236,236 at pages 4-18, also see Fig. 1-17), discloses an EIW (Enhanced Interactive Window) and electronic page view, which includes steps of viewing the extracted information functions to give a computer user the ability to easily read the electronic information. As shown in FIG. 10, the free flowing textual information.

Thus, Using the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims, It is noted, the Allam provisional 60/236,236 fairly teach and/or suggest the claims' limitations such as EIW (Enhanced Interactive Window) and electronic page view, which includes steps of viewing the extracted information functions to give a computer user the ability to easily read the electronic information (As shown in FIG. 10), the free flowing textual information as cited in the Final Office Action mailed 11/29/2005.

Therefor the previous rejection is proper for at least the reason state above and in the previous rejection...

William L. Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
2/9/2006